

From: mike@truthout.org
Sent: 3/19/2012 11:30:48 AM

To: "Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA" <seneca.roy@epa.gov>
CC:
Subject: Media Inquiry From Truthout

Hello, Mike Ludwig here reporting for Truthout.org. I'm looking for a copy of the Dimock press release from Thursday and any updated information on the water testing there, I couldn't find the release on the site. As one could expect, the anti-frackers are not happy with the EPA's results. You've probably already seen these questions (below) from Water Defense, can you email me responses to any of them? Thanks again for your help.

- Mike Ludwig

- Why is EPA Region 3's handling of the Dimock case so different from the way other EPA regional offices have handled similar cases in Texas and Wyoming? When similar contamination was reported in Pavillion, EPA Region 8 refused to release any results until after a year's worth of testing was complete. When EPA finally released results showing that the gas industry had poisoned Pavillion's water, the EPA let the data speak for itself instead of editorializing. We would expect the same kind of balanced approach in Dimock.

In Texas, EPA Region 6 ordered Range Resources to provide replacement water to families after their water was found to be contaminated with explosive levels of methane, which the EPA found posed an "imminent endangerment to the health of persons using those private drinking wells." In contrast, EPA Region 3 acknowledges that the Dimock residents' water is chock full of explosive levels of methane, but says the methane is not a health or safety problem. What accounts for this difference?

In terms of chemicals present in the Dimock residents' water, how is EPA establishing a standard of safety? Previous testing of Dimock water has found high levels of contaminants for which safe levels have not yet been established by EPA or DEP, but which are known to present possible health risks, including: naphthalene, phenanthrene, butyl benzyl phthalate, 1-methylnaphthalene, 2-methylnaphthalene, diethylene glycol, triethylene glycol, 2-methoxyethanol, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) adipate, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) phthalate, methylene blue active substances, gas range organics, acetone and ammonia. Although not presently regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and thus no MCLs exist, these chemicals are not safe for ingestion, in either the short or long term.

--

Mike Ludwig
Truthout Reporter
Mike@truthout.org
Work: (530) 414 0841
Cell: (440) 655 7626
www.Truth-out.org